In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

…..

Criminal Misc. No.27028-M of 2007

…..

Date of decision:30.4.2007

Gurjeet Kaur and another

…..Petitioners

v.

State of Punjab and others

…..Respondents

…..

Present: Mr. Avtar Singh Bhatti, Advocate for the petitioners.

……

S.S. Saron, J.

This petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. has been filed for issuance of directions to respondents No.1 to 3 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners and also to protect them from false implication in a criminal case at the behest of respondents No.4 to 11.

The petitioners are known to each other from the childhood. The maternal uncle of petitioner No.1 is the neighbour of petitioner No.2. They developed friendship amongst themselves and on attaining the age of majority they decided to marry each other. The petitioner No.2 is a qualified M.A. B.Ed. He is working with Hutch Company and getting salary to the tune of Rs.12,000/- per month. The petitioner No.1 is also M.A. B.Ed. She spoke to her mother about the marriage who refused. The respondent No.4, who is the mother of petitioner No.1, looked for a match

for her but she refused. Thereafter, the petitioners solemnized their marriage on 27.4.2007. As per the certificate dated 27.4.2007 (Annexure-P.4) the marriage was solemnized at Gurdwara Sahib Charan Kamal Sahib, Sector 49-C, Chandigarh. Photographs of the marriage have been placed on record as Annexure-P.3. Since the marriage is not to the liking of the relatives of the petitioner No.1 the petitioners fear danger to their life and liberty from respondents No.4 to 11. They accordingly seek protection.

After hearing learned counsel for the petitioners and perusing the paper book it may appropriately be noticed that before approaching this Court the petitioners have not approached SSP, Police District Khanna (respondent No.2) nor SHO, Police Station City Khanna (respondent No.3) setting out their grievances as have been made in the present petition.

In the facts and circumstances as pleaded and having regard to the nature of allegations the respondents No.2 and 3 would be in a better position to know the ground realities.

In the circumstances, the petition is disposed of with a direction that in case the petitioners approach respondents No.2 and 3 setting out their grievances as have been made in the present petition the same would be looked into by them independently and in accordance with law.

April 30, 2007. **(S.S. Saron)**
Judge

hsp